M1605
Group II/III, New York
Wednesday, June 18, 1969

Mr. Nyland: We don't see much in the back, huh? How will we call this, Group II or Group III? I cannot go by what I know because as they are, I cannot see the faces and there are many people, of course, I don't know. It's interesting that there is an accumulation and a gradual increase in interest. I don't know why you are interested, than only of course I hope that there is something about Gurdjieff and his particular philosophy, that for some reason or other appeals to you. And even if we take 50 percent curiosity, I'm sure there are some who definitely want to find out a little bit more about serious questions of life. So, I will assume simply that that is the case and whatever the number in percentage is, it doesn't matter very much because even if there are just a few, it is worthwhile to talk about the ideas and for that reason I would say it is a group in which, with a few newcomers, there is enough interest to know something about Work on oneself. And those who do know already a little and even may have tried and in some way practiced, they may have some questions and I would prefer this time—I think I mentioned it last weekend—today it will depend on the kind of questions that you will ask. So the meeting is open now for anyone who has a question.

There is always a little period that is needed, a little silence for you to formulate the kind of question. But I'm sure that those who wanted to ask already have formulated, so don't wait. Yea - Oh, I think, do you?

Richard Lipton: Mr. Nyland, I had a certain period a few months ago where for three weeks I found it very easy to Work. I couldn't explain it. I only felt that at that time, for a

certain reason which I wasn't aware of, I had more wish. And using the formula, which you spoke of at that time—mainly "1, 3, 2" and what that meant—I was able, with the help of that wish, to be much more Aware any time I felt the wish to Work. It got so that for a certain time I was wondering how long this would last and how long I could keep up these attempts which I made much more often than I, than ever before. Then after this period of a few weeks, it went away and now I find that I can't do it like that anymore, and I was wondering what could bring that back. What could cause it and then leave, and why don't I have the wish? That energy that was there and that made those days like a certain period of brightness which I can look back on from now, when it's gotten cloudy again?

Mr. Nyland: How do you think that the wish originally starts?

Richard: It starts from my realizing what I am. And the knowledge of that...

Mr. Nyland: Yea, but it must also have been stimulated in a certain way, because I'm sure that already for quite some time you have been trying to find out what you really were and it might have ended up in a certain wish, but perhaps not strong enough. Then when one gets an outside stimulus of some kind, like a task or even the fact that one puts in words what is in your mind, and that the clarification, because of that kind of an attempt, usually will give an openness to a person and then something is said, you will take it with a great deal of more enthusiasm. And then for a little while you have a certain impetus which again is stimulated originally by the wish of your own and also then whatever may be the effect of, let's call it, the 'answer' or the 'suggestion' of a task; and also that will run dry because the initial energy is not sufficiently fed. Ultimately, what has to feed it is the condition in which you find yourself and the knowledge that something ought to be done about it. Now that, I think, always should remain. That is, one is not changing so easily, and even assuming that you did change, the fact that one changes—and I hope then for the better—will even encourage one to continue.

So, you can go from there in many different directions. Because in the first place it is now a little less. If you now ask yourself, "Am I already so much better that I don't have that kind of a wish or that I feel that I already have accomplished certain things so that then when I look at myself, I'm a little bit more satisfied." That is one. The other is, "Why is it that I don't have any interest in myself, to look at myself as I am." And that may be caused by a variety of different forms of interest which take up your energy during a certain period, and then there is not enough left of the consideration of, that something should be done about yourself.

It also may mean that that what I try—as the result of an impetus giving a task—in the nature of the task will run dry. Because each attempt I make, when I make it for a certain length of time, is bound to run down since it becomes monotonous, and the initial energy that I had for it, and enthusiasm, must, of course, disappear because the newness wears off and also the facility in doing it perhaps increases and also the acquaintance with which I now do a task—that I already know since yesterday I did it and I know what would be the result—my interest becomes less and less.

I think all these kind of considerations can be taken together, and if I find that at a certain time I have less desire to do anything about myself, I would honestly forget about the task and then start to realize, if the task has had any good effect in an improvement of myself or that if I am honest in trying to see what I am, that I'm still in the same state.

So, I would stop the task instead of trying to revamp it a little bit, and I would go back to the acquisition of a certain kind of self knowledge of your self, in your behavior in life. I would also forget, for the time being, that it is necessary, for Work, to be Impartial to it. I would simply consider it now a question: here I am in life and I'm living and I have relations here and there and I react to the different things that affect me, and I try now to come to an honest opinion about myself, even if it is subjective. After a little while, after

two or three days of that, I'm quite certain that you have accumulated knowledge about yourself which will again give you a wish, that certain things are not entirely right. And, instead of staring yourself blind on the task which is not working any more, I would simply say, "Thank you very much for whatever it has given me." Apparently, it's now worn off so I have to do something else, and I go back again in ordinary life and try to find out what I am.

I think it is very good sometimes to forget about Work and to become very normal and to do as if I don't know anything about Work, and I would consider myself simply as an ordinary human being with the thoughts that I've had before and the thoughts which at the time led you to Work. Simply, you are still an ordinary normal kind of a person behaving in a certain way in life. And I would become acquainted with myself a little bit more, and if you are adventurous I would introduce certain conditions which perhaps may be a little different than before—let's say, like breaking certain habits that you have, and bringing them to the foreground, or allowing yourself to think about certain questions you have not thought about for some time. Or, induce the thought process by means of reading some kind of a book, or going into a certain ambition you might have and actually, I would say, "Doing it to death." But in any event, become much more intense in what you have been doing so that your life takes on much more color. At the same time, having in mind that when you experience these situations, that then you have an opinion about it in your mind and you make that, of course, as truthful as you can.

The point of all this, is always that you, as a personality, remain a reacting creature to the affairs of the outside world, which of course are affecting you and of which you receive impressions. So that ultimately it is not the outside world and the experiences—your wishes to find out whatever <u>they</u> were worth—but you want to find out what is the effect on you. And, I say, "Remain for some time subjective." And then you have some facts,

again accumulated; part of which you know because you know certain traits of your character, you also know kind of what 'type', or how you are, and sometimes you can recognize what you have then again experienced after the task was fulfilled. But, in the meantime, you will accumulate a great deal of material which then can be useful to be converted into a wish to Work again.

You understand what I mean? One talks with oneself. You consider it. You say, "I had a task, thank goodness, it helped a little. At least during that period I remember that certain things took place, but now, apparently, it doesn't work any more. Now I go ahead with ordinary life with as much enthusiasm as I can have and I will find out again and again what it is that is experiencing your life." All right?

Richard: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Who is in the back there?

Larry Karabaic: Mr. Nyland, I have a question that is confusing me a little bit in terms of the two phrases that I heard and I'm trying to use, and I think they conflict a little bit in my mind. One is the technique of ABC, particularly the idea of 'Impartiality', and the other phrase that I heard spoken of on tapes and in meetings called 'self-remembering', and I have a conflict in that if I am to be impartial about observing myself, I cannot use my memory of myself, and, on the other hand, I have also the phrases that I heard: self remembering, uh, is necessary for Work on yourself. I wonder if I could ask you to explain those two things to me.

Mr. Nyland: When you say, now, that self remembering is necessary for Work on yourself, there is twice the word 'self' in it. Are they the same?

Larry: This I don't know. I suspect that they they're different.

Mr. Nyland: We make a distinction, in self remembering, in using the word 'self': one written with a capital 'S' and the other with a small 's'. And let's start with that first. What

do I really mean when I say, "I wish to remember, myself." Of course, it has to do with a memory of a recalling of something that I can remember, even if it is way past, or may have been in the beginning of my life.

When I talk about my 'self', what do I really mean? The changeable self that I know about when I live in daily life and I turn one or another facet to different people, and I behave differently towards different people because of different relationships, that then my 'self' is forced to take on certain manifestations dependent on the conditions I happen to meet. This is my ordinary 'self', my 'Am-ness' in the sense that I, when I use this word "I" for myself, going by a certain name, that I experience certain things and that is then digested by my self, as I am.

This particular self, of course, is the personality and the different ways by which it is made up, and whatever there is in this personality as a physical or a feeling or a mental center. Whatever the definitions are for that kind of a center, I find myself with three different aspects of myself and usually in activity it is obvious that that what I do with my physical body is usually instigated or affected by that what I think or what I feel. This is my ordinary self in ordinary life.

If one starts to consider the possibility that a man as he is, in ordinary life, is not only that what he presents to the outside world, but that there might be, for him, a certain quality inside himself, which he first starts to call an 'essential' quality. By 'essential', he means that it is a little bit more truthful. It is not as superficial. It is also a little bit more lasting because it cannot be rubbed off so easily. And the adaptation of one's essence is a little different from the adaptation of what I call my 'ordinary' physical behavior in whatever manifestations I happen to manifest. So that when I say there is something 'essential' in me, I say then that that what is not on the surface, what is much more my own, I have to find when I want to go a little bit further inside and I try then to come to the

reality of myself, because that what I feel is 'essential' I will not loose so easily. I may have an opinion that someone is telling me and I adopt it because I have no particular reason not to adopt it. But when it comes to an essential question, that sometimes in thinking about it I say "That is really a question that has to come from my heart," or if I have a very terrible experience—that I say "It's a question between life and death"—then I start to make distinctions between that what is my ordinary behavior to the outside world and which everybody else can see, and that what I also know exists within me and I start calling it 'essential'. And then I say, "I want really that what is essential in me not to be disturbed too much by conditions as I have to live them, I would like to have within myself something that is much more, let's call it 'solid', or at least indelible or something that I can be sure of, and is dependable; then I go inside and I call it more and more 'essential'.

If I proceed simply by trying to come closer and closer to this inner existence of myself, I will know that in essence there are also different gradations, and that after some time say, "No, that is <u>really</u> essential; it is not superficial." If I can compare it, and going from the surface of the outside to that what is a central point within myself, there are, of course, different layers, also on the surface a little bit more flippant—or less—a little deeper, a little bit more essential, a little bit more essentially essence, and so forth until I come to a point within myself in which I say, "This is really what I am," because it is not affected by the outside world, it is always something that I know that exists and it cannot be touched, not even by my best friends, and it belongs to my private life.

It is really that kind of 'Self' that we talk about when I say, "I want to remember, myself." The question is always, how far do I have to go inside until I reach that particular kind of state? And I could start to describe it, that if I could reach it I would be at home or I would have a certain balance within myself which is not disturbed, and in general one would say that a person acting from that standpoint inside of himself is more poised. He

would be able to control certain thoughts or feelings which then need not have an expression because there is a force in him that tells him not to do this or not to do that.

Whatever it may be that gradually starts to develop in a man which is more of his - and we call it 'inner life' - and to what extent that is also affected by certain influences from the outside—that is, that what I read and take in and digest, that what I admire, that what is told to me in great confidence or in truthfulness, and very often that what is told to me about myself which I then partly can agree with and partly cannot; in other words, whenever I face the truth—something is in me touched, which, in a superficial way of living, I'm not interested in.

The question of this inner, inner life, that what is essentially myself, I call that my 'Self', and the more it is my Self, the more it will become dependable and not be changeable. Thinking about this further, I come to the conclusion that that what I really mean is, that what is my life within myself, for which Gurdjieff has the name of a 'Magnetic Center', and it is the central point which really makes me alive and from where this life has spread over the different cells of my body and have, of course, gone over into the different organs which are functioning. But then when I want to say, "That what is the reality of myself," it is situated in that where life originally was and from where it started to grow.

If you put it that way, that what is there now, as life in me, and having lived through the years of experience and being born on Earth and then being affected, that what really started me off in this world was a result of two things. That is, I was definitely affected by whatever was and came from my father and mother when I was conceived, and that I call simply 'hereditary influences' or 'biological' ones. Then, immediately when I was born, and even the moment of conception, was a very definite something for me in which life was put in the form which afterwards I call 'my body'. And that that became such a fact of being born and, you might say, of such outstanding value for myself because it's is the only

reason that I happen to be on this Earth, that then at the moment of birth, or at the moment of conception, I was dependent then on the conditions as they were outside of me, and in general we call this the influence of astrology and drawing a horoscope and trying to understand what are the influences of different planets and the Sun, and whatever—rising sign and the moon and so forth—I then acquire at that time a certain knowledge about myself which is there at the moment of my birth or conception and which determines to a certain extent my 'type'.

Whatever it is, now, that I start out with in life, that what is the influence and the result of my father and mother and perhaps generations before, and that what has been given to me at the time when I was born, those are two very definite influences with which I start. As soon as I start to breathe and I start to grow and accumulate, through food that I take in, more and more cells and develop and grow up until I am 18 or 20 and not grow any more in the physical sense, in the meantime what has taken place is an experience of myself as a result of impressions which I have received from the outside world. And in that, of course, I include education and influences from all kind of family, teachers and people, reading matter—in general, that what is in the world with which I have been in contact and which then have given me certain characteristic properties. Those are the characteristics which are given to me because of life, and they - life on Earth, and they are called 'acquired characteristics'. So that when I finally—let's say at the age of 18 or 33 or whenever it is, the time that I start considering these questions—I then am the result of three definite, three different kinds of influences: father and mother and heredity, astrological conditions, and acquired characteristics which have made up my personality and the manifestations.

Now, it is a question: what is my 'self' that always has remained with me during my life? It's obvious it's not the acquired characteristics. And usually the manifestations of

my physical body are determined by that as a form of reacting against the outside world. Then the question is, is my 'self' really that what I was astrologically, or what was formed in me because of astrological conditions, or is it the influence of a biological kind, that I now consider my 'life' as received from my father and mother? And I must conclude that not even astrology can tell me that my self was really already there for myself. And that the only way by which I can understand my reality of that what I was, is how life was formed in me, or what kind of shape my life took on after conception. And so that the real 'Self' is really that what was the original conception of two cells meeting and then forming an entity into which life was poured, coming from my parents and then being taken by me in its very infancy and started to grow through a period of gestation until I was born on this Earth.

What I now mean by the real 'Self' is that what is originally my own and what I call my 'life' in my form of a body. Now, when I say "I wish to remember," I have very little memory of that kind of life because that what is my memory at the present time is not capable of going far enough down into my own history and coming to the year zero, when I appeared on Earth, because there was nothing at that time to record. To some extent I can go by hearsay. To some extent I can pick up that what is my memory at a very early age and also to some extent I can more or less picture how I was as a young man, very very young as a child in which perhaps there were certain indications of being unspoiled as yet by the affairs of ordinary life around me; that is, before I was educated, before I actually learned that the rest of the world existed, there may be certain moments that are still in my memory, somehow or other registered. Also that is very vague. And then when I say, "I now wish to remember <u>that</u> Self, what I really am in essential essence, then I have a hard time to find out what it used to be when I was young. And the only thing that is still left for me is to find if, in the present time—when I now live and when I now experience and that I am now subject to the influences of the outside world and that what is now my personality

behaving in a certain way and that what I also wish to call my 'inner' life—that there may be moments which I can recall in which there was something apparent for me without all the folderol of my outside behavior forms.

When I have an experience of really knowing that I existed and was alive, if I do know that at such a time life did exist, without even any thought or a feeling about it, without even registering that there was a body, but that the fact of my existence existed—such moments, for instance, when one has to catch one's breath, in which something is happening that is absolutely impossible to describe and it is as if something is so entirely new that one never has seen it, or that at a certain time, a certain moment, I derive from conditions, as I meet them, a certain insight in myself, that hits me in the pit of my stomach, or that affects my heart in such a way that it is impossible even to describe it or even sometimes to experience it—that if at such a moment this kind of a life force, which is in me, becomes like a flash, apparent in my recognition which then is in my memory, of facts which I will not forget as far as my life is concerned.

And I have to use these kind of ideas—simply, what is my 'self'—by remembering that what has taken place in me, in my development, in which there were certain moments which I then start to describe as moments of a realization of freedom from that what was my body. This is the real meaning of 'Self': as life, for me.

Philosophically speaking, if there is life in me and if I see life in others, I start to question this life energy as a force, and when I see manifestations of life all around me, even including animals or plants—by that what I call 'organic life'—then I also speculate about the necessity of, how can I consider this part of my life in this form of my body, and consider then at the same time life also existing somewhere else, also in a form?

Philosophically, again—trying to think about it—I must come to the conclusion that life is not at all death; otherwise I would not have a name for that kind of an appearance.

And when I say that when one dies, or that the physical body dies, I still have hope that life can remain in existence because there are certain things in my, in my inner life which I don't think are subject to physical death, to the extent, now, that in the development of myself there is a consideration of what I am, I become more and more, let's say, 'sensitive', or 'ethereal', or that what is less and less material, or that what is partly a concept—sometimes a thought without a form, sometimes a feeling that I know exists only as a rate of vibration—or that what becomes an emotion which affects me very deeply, that then I say, "This is an expression of my life as it really is." And I wish to remember that form of life.

I call it now a 'form' of life since, for me, I am identified with the form and the life that it contains, and my problem is to see if I could conceive of life existing without this form; and for that reason I hope that if I die, that something remains in existence.

If one goes further from that in thinking and to try to analyze the depth that is necessary in order for oneself to become more satisfied with trying to solve such questions for oneself, one has to give it a perspective and a background. Because the fact that all life seems to exist on Earth, makes me question if there is life not only on Earth, but somewhere else. And then when I say that life, being for me that what I hope will always remain in existence and I ascribe to it a particular quality I call 'eternal' and I say, 'eternal life', for me then it become identical to that what I call 'God'—not knowing what is meant by that name, even, but representing for me, sometimes I say, "As if the Creator gives life to man on Earth, that then He, as life giver, must be, of course, the life itself."

So then I come to the conclusion, when life is eternal—that is, endless for me—it must be same as Infinity—which is also endless. And then, of course, in that way I lose myself, because I have no capacity for further conceiving of that kind of a concept.

But, what is clear to me is that what I wish to remember is that what I was when I was

unspoiled, and when it was just put in a form in which there was no atmosphere as yet because I had no education. So that the reality, then, you might say, 'came to the surface' and was all of me, as reality.

Now, what do I wish when I say, "I wish to remember myself." The reason for remembering is that what I, at the present time, maybe have forgotten; or, in any event, it is not a reality for me. And when I want to bring it back by means of memory, I want to bring back this kind of concept, of my Self as 'life'. And when I say, now, "This remembering of my Self is needed for the wish to Work on my self," then I mean that that what I want to create as a presence to myself which I want to remember, is that what I am, in reality, to be present to that what is now me—and I call my 'ordinary' self.

Now, this question of how this can take place, and the reason for it, of course is obvious. Because if one, living in one's ordinary self, is constantly affected by the changeability of that what I as a personality am, and that whenever I happen to live and meet other people, and that I see that I am, surely to some extent, also thrown, and that I am reacting constantly towards that what comes in from the outside, and that I really have nothing in myself as I am, and I am a being, a changeable creature which every day is a little different, and different even during the day, and knowing myself well enough even subjectively—that I behave differently after I have eaten than before, or that I am not really to be talked to because I am too sleepy, or perhaps because I don't have my cup of coffee in the morning and therefore I cannot as yet think, and whatever it is that I want to describe as my personality—that is the kind of a self that I cannot rely on. And then I wish to remember something that was there already before I was born, and that that, in being born—taking on this particular form—gradually got spoiled as I am, and finally presenting itself as life in the form of my personality, or as a human being. And what I wish to remember now is how it really was, and that what really is within me in that what is the

essential essence of myself.

This is as far as self remembering is concerned. To what extent it will lead, at a certain time, to a realization that this 'Self' is really that what I wish to unite with, or that I would like to have this form disappear so that that Self could be set free, it is exactly the same as if I wish, in my ordinary life, that someone like God—and I try to describe that as a higher form of Being and perhaps I say, "A higher form of life"—would be willing to come, to me; or to tell me; or that I, in the presence of such a Being, would be able, under that kind of an influence, to remember my Self easier.

Now, the question of ABC and Work is really the same thing. I wish to have in my mind a concept of something that is independent of myself, and when I say, "I wish to remember my Self and set my Self—with a capital 'S'—free," I wish, now, something of myself to be free, even when I happen to live on Earth and I know the bondage of Earth. So, in that way, thinking about such a process, I would like to create something that in my mind, and perhaps in the beginning as imagination, I hope that could exist as a concept, and that gradually I would like to give it life; so that it can then really exist as an entity, as something created by me in which I, in that creation, pour life. And I wish this life to represent that what is my Self. And I try, now, in my ordinary mind and feeling, to make a Self, or at least something like a replica of that what is–and I simply call it my 'highest' or 'deepest' wish, and that what I call the 'purest' form of my mental functioning. And I endow this, what I wish to create as a Little 'I', as something that is then created by me and endowed with that what is the highest form of my Self that I can conceive of, and to some extent I hope that it will be a replica of my real Self, in essence.

So, the creation of this what we call the 'Little 'I'' for the purpose of accumulating data about my real Self; that is, I wish this 'I' to record that what I really am, and I want to record certain things of myself existing, in which the different acquired characteristics,

which I have acquired in my life and which I call 'education' and sometimes I call 'feeling' and 'thinking', are excluded. So that then, what is really recorded is my true Self, as a fact of existence, and what I wish to have this 'I' accumulate as facts are representations of my life as it really is, without my form.

This I call 'Objectivity'; because the form, for me, represents subjectivity. And when I say, "I wish to Observe my life," then I want to do away–or, rather, I want to be able to see through—my ordinary self as form, so that what is the reality of my Self, this time with a capital 'S'. And the process of Observation, by that what is the Little 'I', simply means to see if that kind of Observation process can penetrate me as I am as a personality, until that what is reached is finally the ultimate truth of my Self as my life existing.

So, it is obvious that in this kind of an Observation, it is necessary to do away with all the obstacles that might be in the way. That is, I cannot afford to have any particular feeling about that what I register as a fact of my life. And I don't want that, because it belongs to my feeling center, and that belongs to my form as a personality, and that is subjective, and my aim has been to make this Little 'I' an Objective something regarding myself. At the same time, that what I wish this Little 'I' to do for me, is to be free from all forms of mental rationalizations, of that what takes place in my brain and which, at the time when it always enters in the accumulation of ordinary self knowledge, always starts me off on a road of explaining certain things just a little bit different from that what is absolute truth. And I want to get free from this.

So, the Little 'I', now, has a task since it is endowed with the highest quality of myself, to use this kind of, let's say 'entity' which I have created, for one purpose only: to be able to become Aware of my Self as I am—that is, my real Self—and that it will not tolerate any kind of like or dislike, or any kind of interpretation. We simply call that, that we wish this 'I' to become 'Impartial' to me. And I mean, now, Impartial to that what is my

ordinary self, so that that, as ordinary self, does not exist any longer–you see, when I am Impartial, it has no existence. And in introducing it in that way, I say it really means that I wish this Little 'I' to be able see through my ordinary forms of behavior, and it becomes, then, intellectually cold—until it finds real life within myself.

So, the Impartiality is easier understood, perhaps, than the question of a moment, and I must use moments in order to free myself from all kind of conditioning in my mind; any kind of a form of rationalization is always based on what has been already a subjective fact in my memory, or even what is an anticipation of the future. And I call it 'moment' as distinguished from a section of time, because it has a property of not having any dimensions whatsoever. And this is really meant by the word 'Simultaneity', because that what can take place at the same time does not need a distance to go through in order to be registered.

So, you see, the function of 'I' is really the same: that it will bring out of me that what is my real Self. And that I sometimes say, this 'I', having that kind of ability, is like God when He recognizes that what I really am as life. And to change it a little bit, I simply say that when this particular process of ABC, when it sounds a little too intellectual or perhaps by definition is a little bit too much for me, that I then say, "What I really wish is that God could be present to my life as my life is," and that in the presence of God as all life, that what is my life is not encumbered by the form in which it happens to exist in my body. This is really the presence of something, and that what will then register that fact of presence, is my emotional state. Because it is that deep emotion, expressed religiously, which gives me the wish of God being present to me. And under the influence of that what I attribute to God as the different forms of attributes—Omniscience, Omnipresence and whatever it may be—that that, then, in its nature as God, will affect me in my nature as my Self, to bring out that what is the real nature of my Self as a capital 'S'. You understand?

Side 2 Questioner: Am I correct in understanding that before one can remember one's self, one's real self, that one has to be aware of the other parts...

Mr. Nyland: No, if you understand what is meant, what we call the 'method', how to Work on oneself, I will accept myself as I am now manifesting, as I am, for whatever it happens to be. The Little 'I' is not interested in describing it or liking it, or placing it in a pigeon hole somewhere. I want to have that, what I am, as manifestation of my physical body, simply registered as the fact of my existence. So, all the parts of my personality gradually should be under that kind of a process of Observation, and the reason I single out the physical behavior is because I would like to make it a little easier for 'I' to be able to be Impartial and to be able to understand or to function in a moment, or in an instant of time.

So, I do not know what your particular question is, what you mean by the other parts. The Little 'I' has, as a task, to Observe what I am in manifestations, in which we then also select a few that are most obvious: like the movement of the body and like the expression on your face, or that what might be the tone of your voice, or that what is a posture, or a gesture. Those are the five different ways by which a human being manifests himself on Earth. There are other conditions within himself, but they are not immediately objects for Observing. I want to become acquainted with myself as I am, without any description or like. This is the function of 'I'. This is the beginning of Work. This is the moment in which, then, 'I', registering that kind of a fact about myself, will make 'I', as 'I' is, Aware of me. And I call the process an 'Awareness' process when it is centered in that what is 'I'.

And 'I' being created by me, functions now as a separate part of myself in order to grow by the accumulation of such facts about my physical body, that then this 'I' will grow out and become an entity of value to me. If there is anything in my ordinary life as subjectivity and if, besides that, next to it or part of it, there is something that can function Objectively—that is, free from all the different forms of my thought and feeling—that then

it could become of extreme value to myself if this Objective faculty could tell me the truth about myself. And the truth is, that what I wish is that what is my life, I want to set free.

So, I do not know what you mean by the other parts. Work simply, in the beginning, is to try to have the Little 'I' be Aware of me as I am. And the continuation of that wish, in the creation of this Little 'I', continuing then to remain Aware, I call a state of 'Awakening' on the part of the Little 'I'. It also implies that that what is being Observed remains unconscious, and remains subjective.

Questioner: Is that Little 'I' the I that remembers itself?

Mr. Nyland: The Little 'I' has to be created by me. When I say, "I remember my Self," my ordinary mind tries to recall that what I was as Self unspoiled. In principle, that what is my life when it started on Earth and that what is created by me as 'I' are the same; in principle. It is also the same as that what is still existing within myself as Magnetic Center. It is also the same as the principle implied in the existence of His Endlessness. All of that is part of an Objective world in which of course, again, there are different gradations, but that what is the essential essence of the Objective world, I call 'God'. And all the different forms in which the Objective world, even, starts to manifest itself, are dependent on the kind of forms, where they are, and the 'I', as a form of life created by me, has to take on a form which is belonging to me, and which I can understand as a form, but where the object of that what is 'I', having to function in an Objective sense regarding me, has then a quality which I, in my subjective state, do not possess.

Keep on thinking about it until you are clearer.

New Questioner: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

Questioner: How would you, uh, how do you stay with a store of energy so you are able to Work?

Mr. Nyland: I don't think you have to store it. I think it is there already stored, but it is not accessible. I think it is used up in many cases for things that are absolutely unnecessary. But it need not be used. There are many things—for instance, in relaxation—which will release energy, and I would, for the time being, simply consider that question of energy, how can I get it without even having to pray for it. If you relax your muscles, because when you sit you don't need much to keep your muscles tense, you could relax very well. Whenever a muscle is relaxed, that energy that is carried by means of the blood is not used, and is returned by the blood again into the rest of your body. The energy that is stored away in one is simply expressed as health, or activity of the body itself, and also will make the other organs function in the way they are usually functioning. If I feel that there is a certain amount of energy flowing into the activity of the three different centers, then it is logical that when I reduce the activity, that there is a surplus of energy. Do you understand?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yea. ... Yea?

New Questioner: When, um, Gurdjieff speaks of, uh, of reciprocal destruction...

Mr. Nyland: About what?

Questioner: Reciprocal destruction.

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

Questioner: I've been trying to locate in some part what it means. I can't.

Mr. Nyland: You can't?

Questioner: I can identify it, in a sense, as a hindrance to Work, it leaves me....

Mr. Nyland: But, if you destroy something, it is of course unable to function. Is there any reciprocal destruction inside of you?

Questioner: Well, I can define it intellectually, I can't...

Mr. Nyland: Can't you define it emotionally? Don't you think there is a fight between your emotion and also your intellect?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Don't you think that your feeling destroys part of your mind and that your mind destroys part of your feeling? It's a very simple case of an inside affair, which you might call 'civil war'. And that is what he means, that when there is energy going into the fighting and that the destruction means that there is something that cannot function any longer, then of course it is deleterious to any possibility of Work. Because, in the first place there is not enough energy left; in the second place, there is no instrument to work with.

And it is such a pity, that many times these things simply go on, because we cannot stop them, since we have never been taught how to stop them. And that I am sensitive to the conditions of myself, that I know there is a great deal of confusion and destruction within me, that then I would like to try to stop that kind of destruction. And, for the simple reason that if I stop it, I reach really two results: one is, it will not require as much energy again, to built it up; and the second place, that what I have acquired already as experience remains available for me.

So, the fight that goes on constantly between the mind and the feeling, is now extended to the inability of the body to know which road to take. And that is destructive to the body itself. Because the body goes sometimes in one way, then it has to go on a detour because the feeling says it should go another way. And I run around like a chicken without a head, constantly using up energy without any particular purpose, than only to change my purpose from time to time and then hoping that there will be a final result which perhaps can be acceptable to myself.

And it is that kind of a condition in which I find myself constantly when I am honest.

Because I see not only that that what takes place between my mind and my feeling, but that what takes place between the different cells—you might say, in my body jockeying for position. Because there are also a great deal of disharmony within the cells, even if all cells represent life. And you can take away, of course, those calls that slough off after seven years, and that life has to go somewhere else, but which are the new cells that are being formed if I want to maintain my physical body?

What is the struggle that takes place when I digest my food? To what extent can even my stomach or the intestines take care of the food, that I feed it? And if there is a great deal of extraneous matter that has no particular nutritive value, that then my stomach is hard put to it and becomes destructive in its own attempt to digest that what is indigestible.

With other words, the processes that take place in a physiological sense, in the body alone, are already mutually destructive, because none of the cells knows that there is something very definite that belongs to the body itself and can guide the body itself. Because there is no means of telling the body at the present time that it ought to have sufficient intellect to guide itself as a body, physically; and that it is dependent on the mind and the feeling, and that the activity of the body, as a result of the thought or a feeling, is then, of course, contradictory. But that even when the body itself tries on its own, and even when it has a certain habitual way of behaving, that it tries to exclude whatever there might even be as a sense of intellect in the body itself, without using my ordinary brains.

And there is no unity. Not even in the cells of the body. There are cells who vie for recognition, who aspire to become something else, and what they are not. There are definitely cells in migration, wanting to move from one place to the other. There are cells that do not want to be sloughed off too soon. There are cells that protect themselves where there is any poison that enters into it, because they don't want to die as yet. And there are many times that certain forms of poison happen to come to me either through food or

through air I breathe or the rotten kind of impressions I receive out of newspapers. And all of that starts to destroy certain functions and atrophy them in time, so that what I finally end up with is a body that is incapable of even meeting ordinary conditions, because I have limited myself to a certain kind of food—not only physically; emotionally and intellectually—and restricted the functioning of my psyche and the functions of my physiological makeup, that I become really a nincompoop compared to what a man should be.

A man ought to be able to eat nails and digest them. He ought to be able to meet all kind of conditions of danger. He ought to be able to have a renewal process in himself, that he can live at least 200 years. He should be able to have a door close and open against all kind of influences that he doesn't wish. He ought to be able to have, you might say, a certain 'coating' that will prevent any form of influence, or any impression, to enter and to go too deep. There is no control of anything that I take in by means of my eyes, because practically everything that I am exposed to I will believe in, more or less—or at least I give it room. And the tremendous amount of sawdust that happens to be in my brain, it is just terrible to carry it around, even, and I would like to discharge it.

And you cannot say that all that kind of extra ballast is not going to affect me in a certain sense—that it <u>will</u> have its place and that reciprocally will kill anything that would like to take its place. And it has more reason of existence as being a higher form of life, that that what is there already does not want to give up, and that for that reason there is a conflict. It's not only the conflict between mind and feeling. It's a conflict between the little cells themselves, all vying for a certain position and to some extent even wanting to be recognized.

This is what is meant by the 'reciprocal destruction'. It is all the time that we, in this kind of a life as we lead now on Earth, are exposed to certain influences that are absolutely

inhuman. And that it requires on our part, as a human being, to take a certain position for which we are not equipped. And as a result, there is chaos—in traffic in New York. And there is an idiocy in living. And there is an accumulation of nonsensical data which never can be digested by anybody. And as a result, that what grows and overgrows becomes much too big even to be managed.

We have lost our contact with the soil as it is, and we cannot be any longer primitive. And we cannot live without a newspaper or a telephone, and we are used to all the kind of cackle and tattle around us so that we can, in that—and with an interest in sports—need not think any more about the condition in which we really are, which cries up to high heaven if we only could see it. But we always slough over a little bit, and we don't want that kind of destruction to take place because we still have a desire to maintain ourselves and what we call 'self-protection'. But what do we protect? Our ordinary little bit of 'self' as it happans to be born on Earth and became a human creature. Self protection will do away with the self destruction.

And the reciprocal destruction, within oneself as an entity, is extended as a destruction of one person on another, and the effect. Any kind of a thought or feeling that one has towards someone and the creation of an atmosphere of a person, around himself, is bound to affect someone in the neighborhood or perhaps even at a distance. All the kind of vile thoughts I might have of someone who is this and that and the other, I cannot control; and they go out of me, and to the extent that they may be intense and perhaps even developed, to that extent will they reach quite far—like a ripple on water when I throw a stone in it. I don't know how far such vibration rates will go, but there is no definite, no particular reason to assume that they will not be destructive. One can feel it in the presence of hate that might exist in someone. You go near it, it is as if there is an oven that is burning, and you are affected by that what the man happens to think or feel, and it

comes out and it will affect you. You can't help that. You are incapable of protecting yourself against it. The presence of a man, for someone who is near him, naturally must affect such a person—either, you can say, to the 'good' or to the 'bad', with a virtue or with a vice, but nevertheless the influences must exist, dependent on the strength of a man who sends it out and dependent on the sensitivity of the person who happens to receive it.

And that is usually the process of destructive forces: one on the other, and again from the other to the one. Because one does not leave a certain activity on someone else alone. One is apt to react to any kind of activity from someone else on one's self. And it is that what makes it reciprocal. If I love you, you might love me. If I hate you, you probably will hate me. If I create around me a certain disturbance of myself and it becomes noticeable, those who are near me will suffer, and they cannot protect themselves well enough to know what to do with it. Only when they are also strong, then they know how to place it, and then it doesn't matter. Then it is exactly the same as if there is oil which will run off a duck's skin.

But, you see, this is only one way of looking at it as applied to man. When Beelzebub talks about reciprocal destruction, it is exactly that what takes place on the Earth as a whole. And then, when it goes to war, when there is that kind of destruction of <u>all</u> forms of energy, of all possibilities and potentialities, of everything that already has been achieved up to a certain point; and you can cite example after example in history, where certain forms of life existing in a certain kind of knowledge—'secrets', you might call it, in the form of some libraries, of that what is really esoteric—has disappeared because of the stupidity of some damned fool who gave an order to burn it all up.

That is the pity of man as a race on Earth. That is the pity under which humanity has suffered ever since he appeared on the Earth. That happens to be the pity of the influence of the Earth on mankind.

Questions about Work. If you are interested, you have to find out. Because you don't know. If you Work, you don't know if the results you get are right. You have to check. Dependent on the kind of a question, I can give you a certain answer. If I talk, I do not know if it even will reach you. If it is a practical question for you in your life, where Work now takes a certain part, perhaps that there is something in your life that you want Work to do for you. Then you have to be honest of reporting certain things and not let me talk.

I wait for your arm to go up. Why? Last time I said, "What is the matter with you?" You're not alive enough regarding Work. I don't care if you are alive in ordinary living, whatever you have to do in New York or out-of-doors. That is just ordinary existence. You'll get along. Don't worry too much. You're not that morose as yet. Sometimes you perhaps may be a little bit difficult and maybe you cannot make up your mind, but maybe time will heal all such wounds.

But we're not talking about ordinary life, than only when in ordinary life you introduce something with the hope that it might help you for further understanding of your ordinary life. And that, gradually, out of that you will find an answer to that problem of: What is the reason of my existence on Earth and what will I have to do with the life when I find myself alive; when I wake up in the morning and there is a whole day ahead of me, what will I do with that day; to what extent can I become responsible for the energy that is within me; what is it that ought to be developed which is not developed now?

And when you Work on yourself, those are the questions that come up. And if you are on the wrong road, too bad for you, because then you have to make a detour and gradually understand what was meant by Objectivity, and perhaps at the present time you think still that it is a kind of a thought process or that perhaps by just reading a little bit in All & Everything or some other kind of a book, that you gradually will acquire this

particular kind of faculty.

Work is Work, and whatever you want to do regarding Work, you owe it to yourself to know that it is in the right direction. Don't waste. Don't waste your energies. If you honestly and seriously are interested in development, then don't waste the time to think about something else when you have a chance to think about your Work. Or, think about that what can stimulate you. Or perhaps perform a certain task for the sake of trying to make this 'I' Wake Up to you when you are performing the task in your unconscious state. Whatever it is.

But, you see, when there are no questions - have you asked yourself why there aren't any? Yes. Yea, did you hold up? Yes.

Jim Scott: I've noticed in making, in trying the attempts to have something present, Observing the posture, it starts with something very simple, like posture. And the result of that is an emotional state. And the result of the emotional state is another Observation, and the result of that is another deepening of the emotional state.

Mr. Nyland: Are you sure that the emotion is used just for the purpose of wishing to Observe those?

Jim: I don't know, because it seems like the observation becomes more widespread.

Mr. Nyland: Are you Impartial in the Observation? Don't let this kind of an idea of Awareness play the wrong part. And don't let it stay in your head as an ordinary thought. Even if the thought is about Work. An Awareness is an experience. It is out of a thought, out of a feeling; it is different. The Awareness is that what takes place in the existence of an 'I' when it is Observing you as you are, unconsciously. And there are two results. One is, since one has created 'I', one knows what takes place with that what you have used for the creation, in that what has been created, particularly when in that creation you have poured the best of that what is you as a form of life. And the second is this: That when 'I'

can exist and, let's hope, remain for a little while in existence, it is a form of light, that it sometimes actually lights up and shines and that you, in your unconscious state, also notices that there is something there that wasn't there before.

So, when I say, "I Observe," and I have then a moment in which an 'I' is Aware of me and perhaps even is present to me, then, of course, that what I am is satisfied—for one moment only—that the fact of an Observation has taken place. To some extent I say I 'enjoy' it or I get into an 'emotional state' about it, and then I want to continue in that kind of a process, when the emotional state was already identification. That is why I ask. If the emotional state is solely directed again to the wish to continue, you are still on the right road. But I am afraid you go off after the first observation.

Jim: That's right. It's...

Mr. Nyland: Be very careful, and don't allow yourself to go into any kind of a feeling, than only a wish to try to continue. And that wish has to be sincere for the continued creation of 'I'. The wish has nothing to do with a changing of yourself or a wish of improvement or a wish for a certain effect that you predetermine. The wish is only to create an 'I' in order to have this 'I' have an experience of Awakening. And no more. So that when I have this sincere wish, I exclude all other kind of wishes. I exclude also all other kinds of thoughts. When I want to Work, I try to reduce my personality to such a simple form that it can stay simple and that nothing will happen to it even if the process of Observation goes on between the 'I' and my manifestations.

What I want is the continuation of that, you might say, as a little cycle between head and my body and my feeling, so that then that little triad becomes dynamic for me: Observation produces a fact, this fact is transmitted to my feeling, which again has a wish that something in me becomes Observant; that what then is again stimulated to Observe, Observes me as my body, and that produces a wish, etcetera, etcetera. In that way it can

continue, but not when the emotional state goes off on a tangent. And that's what happens.

Be very careful to keep it so completely simple, so in conditions in which there is no requirement, practically, of outer life, no requirement of the world, no requirement of even your thoughts or your feeling because you have relaxed and you have drained them out and you have been reduced—yourself as a personality—to just a breathing little creature who has a wish to Wake Up. All right? It is so often a trap, and you fall into it. And when you see you have fallen into it, start over. All right?

Jim: Yes.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland, with the task, uh, you gave me some time ago that I've been doing, I've become, uh, satisfied with myself as a being.

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I think that it becomes monotonous, and it can give you self satisfaction, and you can miss the boat completely. A task is very seldom good for longer than two weeks; at most, one week, really. After that, in the second week it becomes much too familiar, so you don't do the task any more as something that is new.

Questioner: What do you do to—once you become, say, satisfied—to do something; I mean, with yourself, to do more than that. What's the next step?

Mr. Nyland: Go and work at something that you cannot do, and then you will be dissatisfied. There's no answer to it. I can say, "Don't be satisfied." You will remain satisfied because you are so satisfied.

Questioner: I mean satisfied with myself as a being but not because....

Mr. Nyland: Yea, of course. What is there to be satisfied about? Any special kind of ability? Any kind of genius? Any kind of brilliancy in the mind? Any particular strength of your body? What is there to be satisfied about? You just happen to live. There is, you wished perhaps that you are a little better perhaps than someone else, or a little older or a

little taller, or can eat more...

Questioner: No, but when you are dissatisfied...

Mr. Nyland: Well, when you are dissatisfied? You are just looking at it in a very partial way. Of course, I go through stages of liking and disliking myself. In an unconscious state, I am up or down. Every time depends entirely if someone strokes me the right way; and I am a cat, I purr. If someone kicks or steps on my foot, I certainly don't purr.

All the time, this is exactly the state in which one is. What does one do with it? Wait until it goes away. Now, in the meantime, do something that counteracts it. And usually, if you are interested, do something—very heavy work. Active, physically. And if you can, with your mind present, your ordinary mind present to what you are doing. And really, if it is possible, wish to do what you are doing. That will take care of all kind of dissatisfaction. But usually dissatisfaction is just, I call it, a 'parlor word'. You're not dissatisfied. One uses it every once in a while perhaps to arouse a little sympathy, or sometimes to give yourself a certain attitude so that someone can admire you and say, "Look, there is a person with such dissatisfaction."

Yea.

Norman Ernsting: Uh, Mr. Nyland, I had a shock about three weeks ago that gave me a realization and a glimpse of what I really was. It occurred in terms of a relationship with another human being. I realized that there had never been a relationship there, because I hadn't been open to it. I...

Mr. Nyland: Did you blame yourself?

Norman: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Nyland: Did you blame yourself?

Norman: There were guilt feelings, until I realized that I hadn't been controlled, that I hadn't been Aware—not for months, for years—of myself, of...

Mr. Nyland: Have you ever been?

Norman: I have not been...

Mr. Nyland: No. Have you ever been?

Norman: No.

Mr. Nyland: So, your whole life, let's say, you are unaware.

Norman: My whole life, yes.

Mr. Nyland: Alright.

Norman: And I realize that the only real thing to me, and the only real possibility, was connected with the Work. And I realized that for the first time in my life I had a motivation because I was dissatisfied with myself.

Mr. Nyland: I think it's good, isn't it?

Norman: It's good at this point, the dissatisfaction. The point is, now I have to go in a direction.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, it's right. Didn't I talk enough about Work tonight? I think I did. So, maybe this can be the turning point, the change over from an unconscious state into a state of Consciousness. I'm not joking. Any kind of a motivation that brings to you the realization that something is needed, and it doesn't matter if one would go in the direction of Work right away. Because there may be many other different kinds of interests that for a little while even might satisfy, or even can take away the sting of an experience.

If it is Work, perhaps so much the better because then you don't have to waste too much time afterwards and feel sorry that you went too far in a detour. But whatever it is, if now you think you need it because something happened and it was unexpected and you perhaps saw a certain form of mechanicality—or an assumption which was not based on any facts whatsoever—that then now it is necessary to accumulate what you can call the 'beginning' of absolutism within yourself. And I think it is right. So, having said enough

about ABC, remembering oneself, and all the rest, you now know what it is, what one might try as a possibility of the Little 'I' Observing your, some of your physical manifestations; Impartially. All right?

Norman: Could you talk something about relationships? What it can, the possibility of a relationship between a man and a woman?

Mr. Nyland: Well, it is a question as old as the hills, isn't it? And it depends a great deal on the kind of a man and the kind of a woman, and what are the expectations of either one or the other. And to talk about it in a general way as male and female—or as man and woman, or as husband and wife, or as lover and lover, or as father and son, or father and daughter, or mother and son—all these kind of things are relationships that are based partly on one center, sometimes on two, very exceptional on three. And it - there are as many different gradations of relationships between man and woman as there are rays of the Sun.

Norman: But, isn't the basis of a relationship an honesty?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think it is true of everything, not only of the relationship. Honesty starts with oneself. If you are honest with yourself, you try to be honest with someone else. Then you won't expect and you hope that the other person is also honest with him or herself. And then maybe you have a language you can talk about. But when there is no honesty within yourself, you will never have a relationship that will last with anyone else.

Norman: This is what I found out.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Norman: It was a shock.

Mr. Nyland: And you found out the hard way, maybe. And maybe it's very good—how else would you find out?

Norman: It would have never come otherwise.

Mr. Nyland: Maybe. Maybe all of a sudden, if you had a cold shower bath, the thought might have occurred to you, "I'm not honest." But whatever has happened in the past, use now what you know, and then you see what you can do with it. And I would almost say, "Beware of relationships."

Yea.

Fred Pearlman: Uh, you had spoken about sacred books and the reading of them, and I called you and asked for a list and you gave me one book, Bhagavad Gita, which I've just finished.

Mr. Nyland: So, you need another one.

Fred: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Well, what will I add? Let me see, what will I now add, of all the sacred books in the world. You know, the Bhagavad Gita is part of another one?

Fred: I don't, uh, I have a vague idea. The, uh...

Mr. Nyland: Try to get hold of the Mahabarata. Ma-ha-bara-ta.

Fred: Ma-ha-bara-ta.

Mr. Nyland: Mahabarata, if you like. The Bhagavad Gita is part of it. It's a good sacred book. It is also a difficult pill to swallow. And in order to make sure that you won't ask me another question for a year...[laughter]

Fred: Uh, the last time I asked you was, uh, two and a half, three years ago.

Mr. Nyland: Well, then this will take you the next 10 years. [laughter]

Fred: It was worth it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Fred, it's quite right. But, you know, there are really quite a number that I call 'sacred', and sometimes 'secret'. And for those who want to find a treasure, they will only find it when they turn over their own stone, and then say, "This is the secret for me." You will find, if you want it. I would now almost advise you, don't buy or get hold of the

Mahabarata, but look around and see what is there. There is more than enough esoteric literature. There is enough in the Kabala. There is even enough in the Bible, and there are a lot of forgotten books of the Bible—apocrypha—which you can also get hold of. You can also take The Secret Doctrine, by Blavatsky. There are many things. But I promise you, that when I come across a title and I happen to think of Fred Pearlman, I say that would be a good book, I will let you know.

Fred: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: John, this is about it, isn't it?

John: Almost.

Mr. Nyland: It is the end.

John: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Huh? It is the end. Yea.

Edie Katz: When I have a thought to Work, there are, there seem to be two ways that I try to Work. Like there's one way that I seem to try to Observe myself and I think that maybe...

Mr. Nyland: You can do that?

Edie: Well - No, I can't do that. And I don't feel like I understand that. I'm not...

Mr. Nyland: Not even after the explanations of ABC that I gave, of the Little 'I' and the creation, or that what could be the presence of something higher to you and to accept the fact of your existence? Try that in very simple things. Just when you are walking, and stand still, I would say, then, come to your real 'Self' if you can, of that what is you, as if something is there—watching, perhaps, but in any event that you become alert to something that could exist—which is of a different kind and a different level of life than you are. You stand still, you break your mechanicality, and you continue after that. Try this, hundred times during a day, when you go from one room to another and you open the

door and you put on your shoes and you comb your hair. When you sit down and you get up again and you take the first forkful of your food, when you drink a glass of water, when you wash dishes. Any time that is simple, you try to have something there present to you—as you are, unconsciously—hoping that that what could become Aware of you could have enough Consciousness to remain in existence for a little longer, even, than you wish—than your wish. All right? Will we start all over again? Okay.

So, then again next week. But you must remember this group can only be fed by questions and I will really refuse to give a kind of a lecture, although the answer to a question may take the form of a little bit of a - at least it was instigated by a question, so that would be the excuse. So, no questions, no meeting; or, rather, no discussion. Good night.